

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).  
Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50.  
Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXIII, No. 12

MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1930

WHOLE No. 623

*For the especial use of Junior High Schools*

## LIVING LATIN By THURSBY and KYNE

### BOOK ONE

*For grade seven or eight.*

### BOOK TWO

*For grade eight or nine.*

THE stigma, "dead and uninteresting", so often attached to Latin is swept aside by the superior, original, lively presentation of the subject by the authors of LIVING LATIN. The constant correlation between English and Latin, use of simple connected stories, rapid-fire drills, vocabularies at the end of the text, suggestions for entertainments—distinguishing features of the first book—are retained in Book Two.

For the  
**Senior High School**

ULLMAN AND HENRY  
**NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN**  
\$1.40

**SECOND LATIN BOOK,**  
**REVISED**  
\$1.68

ULLMAN AND SMALLEY  
**PROGRESS TESTS IN LATIN**  
\$.80

LAWLER  
**EASY LATIN PLAYS**  
\$.80

ELMER  
**LATIN GRAMMAR**  
\$1.48

**MACMILLAN**

New York      Boston      Chicago  
Dallas      Atlanta      San Francisco

While Book One arouses an interest in the Roman people by a sympathetic presentation of their life and customs, Book Two aims to create an understanding and appreciation of Roman civilization through myths, legends, and historic incidents told in Latin, and by English readings on religion, history, and literature. As in the first book, each lesson begins with a story in simple Latin which emphasizes the new grammatical principle or form to be learned and also reviews the syntax, forms, and words previously studied.

The illustrations of the new book are many and excellent. They include color plates, black and white drawings, and half-tone reproductions of Mediterranean scenes, classic art, etc. Book One, \$1.40, Book Two, \$1.80.

## PLACE'S NEW LATIN BOOKS

By PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE, Litt.D.,  
*Professor of Latin in Syracuse University*

---

FIRST YEAR LATIN \$1.32      INTERMEDIATE LATIN LESSONS \$ .40

FIRST YEAR LATIN, ENLARGED (Including Intermediate Latin Lessons) \$1.40

---

PLACE'S *First Year Latin* supplies in simplified form the course for the first year as reorganized by the Classical Investigation. The forms and principles formerly taken up in the first year but now recommended for study in the second year are presented in the *Intermediate Latin Lessons*, which is intended to cover six weeks' work. Together these two books afford a thorough preparation for the author's *Second Year Latin*.

Ample connected Latin reading matter is included and provision is made for the building up of an historical, cultural background. Latin word formation and the relation of Latin to English are treated in supplementary sections. The word lists of the College Entrance Examination Board and of the New York State Syllabus of 1928 have been followed exactly.

---

### AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

*New York*

*Cincinnati*

*Chicago*

*Boston*

*Atlanta*

# The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIII, No. 12

MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1930

WHOLE No. 623

## THE LATIN TEACHER OF TO-MORROW<sup>1</sup>

Contacts with young men in classes made up of students who are preparing to teach convince one that the Latin teacher of to-morrow will be quite different from the Latin teacher of yesterday or of today. The causes of this difference are not hard to find. In the first place, the unprecedented increase in registration in Secondary Schools during the first quarter of the twentieth century could not fail to modify in a marked degree both the discipline of those Schools and the subject matter taught and studied there. One writer puts the matter thus<sup>2</sup>:

From 1900 to 1925 the population of the United States increased 50.11 per cent. The birth rate has been falling off, so that the population of school age has not kept pace with the general population. . . . Total enrollments in public schools have increased 59% during the past quarter of a century. The greatest increase is in the high school, 603.11 per cent, while the elementary school enrollment has increased only 40.15 per cent, an increase slightly greater than the increase in the school census.

Elsewhere<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Frank M. Phillips, Chief of the United States Division of Educational Statistics, writes, The public high school has had a wonderful growth. Although only a century old its enrollment has reached approximately 4,000,000 pupils. These schools have enrolled 48.2 per cent of those who might be expected to attend high schools. Private high schools and preparatory departments of higher institutions enroll another 4.8 per cent, so that 53% of all pupils of high school age are now enrolled in secondary schools.

The Journal of the National Education Association drew the situation graphically in a recent issue<sup>4</sup>: In 1880 free high schools enrolled 110,277 pupils. Every decade since then the enrollment has approximately doubled so that the figures read: 202,983 in 1890; 519,251 in 1900; 915,061 in 1910; 2,100,239 in 1920; and now more than 4,000,000.

Professor Judd<sup>5</sup> points out that American Secondary School conditions are without parallel anywhere else in the world:

The critics of the American system write elaborate treatises in order to convince us that our program of free universal secondary education is a failure. For my part, I am convinced that the experiment which America is trying cannot be abandoned for the simple reason that human nature here and in every other country is eagerly seeking access to higher education. That the American high school is accessible to all classes in society is a result of the fact that the desires of the common people come more readily to expression under the conditions of American life than under the rigid conditions of the older social orders.

European countries, bound by the traditions of the past, are slowly beginning to demand for all the people what America has long provided.

Whether we are prone to view this situation with dismay, with satisfaction, or with discouragement, we must face the facts squarely and realize their implications for the teaching of the Classics. It is futile and well nigh fatuous to expect in the future conditions that even remotely resemble those under which most of us received our own preparation and training. For example, a favorite saying of one of my most effective Latin teachers was, "You will find it in the Grammar"; we were expected to thumb the Grammar until we had found and comprehended the troublesome construction. 'Excellent training!', I can almost hear you say, and I heartily agree with you, but we should keep constantly in mind the fact that, with the changed complexion of the student body, as the result of the lengthening of the period of compulsory education, there has come a rapid and far-reaching change in the subject matter dealt with in the Schools. Subjects have followed one another in hasty succession into oblivion. Studies that had to apologize for demanding even a small part of the pupils' time have risen from the position of lowly 'optionals' to the dignity of prescription. Community civics, modern European history, economics, and American history just now are in the preferred class. Extra-curricular activities that thirty years ago were quite circumscribed seem almost to overshadow in student perspective the official curriculum. This is neither the time nor the place to open the question of the relative importance of the narrowly intensive and of the so-called enriched curriculum. The point I wish to stress is that, with the radically different student body evolved during the first quarter of the twentieth century, we shall be compelled to expect important consequences in our work in Latin. I may add now in anticipation that I am firmly convinced that many of the efforts made to ease the shock by diluting the classical content have been misguided and inevitably ineffectual. To attempt to teach Latin to the moron is itself moronic.

To a lesser degree what has been said of Secondary education is applicable also to Collegiate instruction, to a lesser degree, I say, for the College may still be considered a fairly selective institution. But in our Colleges certain psychological trends have the more seriously affected the position of Latin and in particular have shaken the confidence of some keen young minds that otherwise might be directed to the classical field. Within a week the principal of one of our large city High Schools asked a colleague of mine if he knew of a man for the English Department of the High School. The very first name that suggested itself to my colleague was that of a student in one of my classes in education who, I knew, had made Latin and Greek

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the Twenty-third Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the Baltimore City College, May 3-4, 1920.

<sup>2</sup>United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1927, No. 13, page 2.

<sup>3</sup>United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1927, No. 33, page 10.

<sup>4</sup>Journal of National Education Association, February, 1929, 52.

<sup>5</sup>Charles Hubbard Judd, The Unique Character of American Secondary Education, 10 (Harvard University Press, 1928).

his major subjects, but recently, on the very eve of graduation, had come to me to admit a diminished faith in the validity of our cause and furthermore to indicate clearly that his work in psychology was chiefly responsible for shaking his confidence in the Classics. Here is an alert, highly intelligent student, of most pleasing address, that I genuinely covet as a teacher of Latin and Greek, but who, in spite of my efforts, may be won over to another department. Situations of this type are the more distressing when I contemplate how very confused and often distinctly inconsistent are the positions taken even by eminent psychologists on the whole question of 'transfer of training'. Professor William C. Bagley, in his editorial introduction to Professor Boyd H. Bode's book, *Modern Educational Theories* (xi), has expressed my thought in forceful language.

More than one of our prophets has, in the first breath, vigorously denied the transfer of training, and, in the second breath, set forth a proposal that swallows—hook, line, and sinker—the doctrine of formal discipline in its most naïve pattern.

It is small wonder, then, if we find in our classes the most grotesque conceptions of 'transfer'. Now the unfortunate part of the matter for us classicists is that in almost every discussion of the topic the study of Latin is offered as 'Exhibit A'. Is it not, then, incumbent upon us whose faith in the efficacy of a classical training is not and cannot be shaken to acquaint ourselves with the common arguments on the question of formal discipline, that we may have equipment adequate to the cause we advocate, and worthy of that cause?

From all his schooling, then, we must expect our Latin teacher of to-morrow to be different from the Latin teacher of to-day. May I now touch upon another phase that may seem commonplace, namely, that the Latin teacher of to-morrow is in our classes to-day? Not all that are pupils in our classes—at least not all that are pupils in *my* classes—will, I trust, aspire to be teachers of Latin. In fact, I am fully persuaded that teachers of Latin are gravely in error when they complain that not all pupils are permitted to elect Latin. One of the necessary consequences of the elimination of the principle of student selectivity in our High Schools is to dictate some type of subject selectivity. For several years one of our metropolitan teachers of Latin has been highly acclaimed for his success with pupils of low mentality. Occasionally there appears a *Beginners' Latin* book for retarded pupils. All such efforts, I believe, injure rather than help our cause. I am not seeking to advertise any prognosis test, but I am sure the day is not far removed when some quite reliable device will enable us to determine who should be admitted, and who should not be admitted, to our classes in Latin. Even with the inadequate instruments now available, an administrator of a School segregated on the basis of individual differences, is, I believe, entirely justified in denying Latin to the 'submerged third'.

Awareness of the presence in our classes of the Latin teacher of to-morrow should also make us keenly sensible of our own responsibility. My brief experience

in a School of Education has impressed upon me the wide divergence in effectiveness among our teachers of Latin. I have been truly amazed at some of the procedures described to me by my students, procedures witnessed by them in School and in College (I, of course, do not allow names of teachers to be mentioned by my students). Quite frequently allusion was made by them to the evident delight with which some teachers of Latin distributed 'failures'. 'Kill' and 'slaughter' would appear favorite verbs in the vocabularies of certain teachers of Latin. One instructor on a College staff, I was informed, could make four syllables out of the word 'died' when he was gloating over the large percentage of failures in his classes. I cannot bring myself to believe that the teachers of Latin were singled out for illustrative purposes simply because of my known interest in Latin, for I can catch the joyousness with which students recall the hours spent with some of our inspiring teachers of the Classics. Many such teachers are 'vitalizing' their work in a multitude of ways. The details it is not the purpose of this paper to describe.

That we should all be ever watchful for opportunities to link our teaching of Latin more closely with life was emphatically brought home to me in a recent experience with a group of pupils who were studying Vergil. A few minutes remained before the bell would tell me to go to meet my section, and I was turning over in my mind the incidents described in the passage toward the close of the fourth book of the *Aeneid* that we were about to read together. It had so happened that earlier in the day in classes in education I had been stressing the importance of 'vitalizing' instruction, and the thought occurred to me, 'Would your own students in education, should they be permitted to observe the class in Vergil, find any evidence of creative teaching?' I tried to think through the work of the coming hour, but the bell called me to duty before the task was completed. Shortly after the opening of the session a young man put this question to me, "Aside from the beauty of the language and the attractiveness of the narrative, what is there in *Aeneid* 4? What message is Vergil trying to convey there?" The question pleased me greatly, for it demonstrated an intelligent, independent criticism of the work we were doing, and, what was more important, it gave me the very question that I should have put to myself when, before beginning the hour, I was searching for an effective approach to my topic. How frequently both student and teacher fail to see the forest for the trees! Forms, syntax, diction assume such alarming proportions that we forget that the authors we are reading really have a message, and that our chief business as teachers is not to catechize our students but rather to direct the interpretation of the message.

There is but one other thought I would leave with you. The Latin teacher of to-morrow, to be efficient, will need adequate opportunity for practice teaching under trained and sympathetic supervision. What joy it has been to see the sincerity and the skill with which at our College some departments have cooperated in



facilitating the practice teaching of our men! I have had occasion to keep in touch with some of the assignments and I have observed the faithfulness of many teachers under whose immediate supervision the pupil-teachers have been placed. Patiently the usual beginner's errors have been noted and helpful suggestions for improvement have been offered. Not all, of course, have been equally conscientious. Some, indeed, would lead you to believe that they thought the bachelor's sheepskin possessed some magic whereby mere graduation from Schools giving certain pedagogical courses would convert the young graduate into an experienced teacher. Cicero, we recall, emphasized the importance of systematic training when he wrote (*Pro Archia* 15), ... *Atque idem ego contendo, cum ad naturam eximiam atque inlustrem accesserit ratio quaedam conformatioque doctrinae, tum illud nescio quid praeclarum ac singulare solere existere.*...

If we agree with Cicero in this matter, we are sure to try to eliminate the distrust that at times seems to exist between the Department of the Classics and the Department of Education. Our departmental heads will encourage their most efficient teachers to take under observation and direction the prospective teachers of Latin, instead of complaining that the presence of these young people simply increases the supervisory burden. Here, indeed, I have felt that there is need for great improvement in our work of preparing the teachers of to-morrow.

It can readily be seen that the purpose of this paper has been not to picture an ideal teacher of Latin either of to-day or of to-morrow, but merely to draw attention to some considerations that must be borne in mind if the Latin teacher of to-morrow is to be what we all sincerely wish that teacher to be. Let us not forget, then, that in education as everywhere else in life change is inevitable. Accordingly, the Latin teacher of to-morrow must be unlike the Latin teacher of yesterday. Furthermore, in many respects we Latin teachers of to-day are the moulders of the Latin teacher of to-morrow. Ours is the responsibility for their development. We cannot escape it simply by bemoaning changed conditions or by criticizing others.

These, friends of the Classics, are some of the impressions made upon a teacher of Latin during a brief but very delightful and helpful experience in a School of Education.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,  
COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK GEORGE M. FALION

## REVIEWS

Early Greek Elegy, The Elegiac Fragments of Callinus, Archilochus, Mimnermus, Tyrtaeus, Solon, Xenophanes, and Others, Edited, with Introduction, Text, Critical Notes, and Commentary, by T. Hudson-Williams. Cardiff: The University of Wales Press Board; London: Humphrey Milford; New York: Oxford University Press (1926). Pp. 132.

Professor T. Hudson-Williams's book, *Early Greek Elegy*, contains a full Introduction (9-38), which is subdivided into a brief discussion of the claims to

seniority of Archilochus and Callinus (9-12), a discussion of Phrygians, Cimmerians, and Lydians (12-19), a lengthy note on Some Questions of Dialect (19-34), consisting of thirteen distinct articles, Bibliographical Notes (35-37), a note on the Manuscripts (37-38), and a list of Some Abbreviations.

The Introduction is followed by the Text, A. Elegies by Natives of Ionia (39-53: Callinus, 39-40, Archilochus, 40-43, Asius, 44, Mimnermus, 44-48, Xenophanes, 49-52, Anacreon, 52-53), B. Elegies by Greeks whose Native Dialect was not Ionic (54-70: Tyrtaeus, 53-59, Solon, 59-70, Cleobulina or Eumetis, Daughter of Cleobulus of Lindus, 70). The Commentary occupies pages 71-132.

In his Preface (3), Professor Hudson-Williams states that he "adopted the term 'Early Elegy' to denote all elegiac verse—except epigrams..., from Callinus to Xenophanes, inclusive". The elegies ascribed to Theognis, already edited by the same scholar in 1910, are not included, nor are recently discovered fragments like those in the Strasburg Papyrus.

The arrangement of the fragments has been based on a sharp distinction between the poets who spoke Ionic as their native language and those who adopted it as a form of 'poetic diction', but did not speak it in everyday life. Thus Group A, 'Pure Elegy', contains Callinus, Archilochus, Asius, Mimnermus, Xenophanes, and Anacreon. Group B, 'Foreign Elegy', contains Tyrtaeus, Solon, and Cleobulina (Eumetis).

Like Mr. J. M. Edmonds' in his *Lyra Graeca* (The Loeb Classical Library), Professor Hudson-Williams has adopted the excellent plan of giving the context of each extract or fragment, instead of leaving it in the anaemic and unsatisfactory isolation of so many previous editions. In fact, the contexts of the present book even improve on the lead set by Mr. Edmonds, for they are strict contexts and not mere matrices to which a scrap of elegy happens to have adhered.

The Introduction is excellent. The author begins by dismissing the barren controversy of the rival claims of Archilochus and Callinus to the title 'Father of Greek Elegy' with the remark that it is best left in the same position as that in which Horace, who presumably had at least as good authorities before him, was content to leave it (*Ars Poetica* 77-78). The all too meager and inconclusive evidence is adequately balanced and sifted.

The notes on the Phrygians, Cimmerians, and Lydians are extremely brief, but they are intended merely to give the environment of the Asiatic elegists and their historical orientation. Then follows one of the most valuable portions of the book, thirteen masterly notes on dialect and linguistic practice. Throughout these and the Commentary the editor refers constantly to the Ionic Inscriptions to support conclusions, often negative conclusions, reached by him. The comments on the aorist passive (30) and on Psilosis (26-28) are especially suggestive.

The Bibliography is complete and usefully arranged.

<sup>1</sup>*Lyra Graeca*, Being the Remains of all the Greek Lyric Poets from Eumelus to Timotheus, Excepting Pindar (The Loeb Classical Library). The volume was reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.185-186).

his major subjects, but recently, on the very eve of graduation, had come to me to admit a diminished faith in the validity of our cause and furthermore to indicate clearly that his work in psychology was chiefly responsible for shaking his confidence in the Classics. Here is an alert, highly intelligent student, of most pleasing address, that I genuinely covet as a teacher of Latin and Greek, but who, in spite of my efforts, may be won over to another department. Situations of this type are the more distressing when I contemplate how very confused and often distinctly inconsistent are the positions taken even by eminent psychologists on the whole question of 'transfer of training'. Professor William C. Bagley, in his editorial introduction to Professor Boyd H. Bode's book, *Modern Educational Theories* (xi), has expressed my thought in forceful language.

More than one of our prophets has, in the first breath, vigorously denied the transfer of training, and, in the second breath, set forth a proposal that swallows—hook, line, and sinker—the doctrine of formal discipline in its most naïve pattern.

It is small wonder, then, if we find in our classes the most grotesque conceptions of 'transfer'. Now the unfortunate part of the matter for us classicists is that in almost every discussion of the topic the study of Latin is offered as 'Exhibit A'. Is it not, then, incumbent upon us whose faith in the efficacy of a classical training is not and cannot be shaken to acquaint ourselves with the common arguments on the question of formal discipline, that we may have equipment adequate to the cause we advocate, and worthy of that cause?

From all his schooling, then, we must expect our Latin teacher of to-morrow to be different from the Latin teacher of to-day. May I now touch upon another phase that may seem commonplace, namely, that the Latin teacher of to-morrow is in our classes to-day? Not all that are pupils in our classes—at least not all that are pupils in *my* classes—will, I trust, aspire to be teachers of Latin. In fact, I am fully persuaded that teachers of Latin are gravely in error when they complain that not all pupils are permitted to elect Latin. One of the necessary consequences of the elimination of the principle of student selectivity in our High Schools is to dictate some type of subject selectivity. For several years one of our metropolitan teachers of Latin has been highly acclaimed for his success with pupils of low mentality. Occasionally there appears a *Beginners' Latin* book for retarded pupils. All such efforts, I believe, injure rather than help our cause. I am not seeking to advertise any prognosis test, but I am sure the day is not far removed when some quite reliable device will enable us to determine who should be admitted, and who should not be admitted, to our classes in Latin. Even with the inadequate instruments now available, an administrator of a School segregated on the basis of individual differences, is, I believe, entirely justified in denying Latin to the 'submerged third'.

Awareness of the presence in our classes of the Latin teacher of to-morrow should also make us keenly sensible of our own responsibility. My brief experience

in a School of Education has impressed upon me the wide divergence in effectiveness among our teachers of Latin. I have been truly amazed at some of the procedures described to me by my students, procedures witnessed by them in School and in College (I, of course, do not allow names of teachers to be mentioned by my students). Quite frequently allusion was made by them to the evident delight with which some teachers of Latin distributed 'failures'. 'Kill' and 'slaughter' would appear favorite verbs in the vocabularies of certain teachers of Latin. One instructor on a College staff, I was informed, could make four syllables out of the word 'died' when he was gloating over the large percentage of failures in his classes. I cannot bring myself to believe that the teachers of Latin were singled out for illustrative purposes simply because of my known interest in Latin, for I can catch the joyousness with which students recall the hours spent with some of our inspiring teachers of the Classics. Many such teachers are 'vitalizing' their work in a multitude of ways. The details it is not the purpose of this paper to describe.

That we should all be ever watchful for opportunities to link our teaching of Latin more closely with life was emphatically brought home to me in a recent experience with a group of pupils who were studying Vergil. A few minutes remained before the bell would tell me to go to meet my section, and I was turning over in my mind the incidents described in the passage toward the close of the fourth book of the *Aeneid* that we were about to read together. It had so happened that earlier in the day in classes in education I had been stressing the importance of 'vitalizing' instruction, and the thought occurred to me, 'Would your own students in education, should they be permitted to observe the class in Vergil, find any evidence of creative teaching?' I tried to think through the work of the coming hour, but the bell called me to duty before the task was completed. Shortly after the opening of the session a young man put this question to me, "Aside from the beauty of the language and the attractiveness of the narrative, what is there in *Aeneid* 4? What message is Vergil trying to convey there?" The question pleased me greatly, for it demonstrated an intelligent, independent criticism of the work we were doing, and, what was more important, it gave me the very question that I should have put to myself when, before beginning the hour, I was searching for an effective approach to my topic. How frequently both student and teacher fail to see the forest for the trees! Forms, syntax, diction assume such alarming proportions that we forget that the authors we are reading really have a message, and that our chief business as teachers is not to catechize our students but rather to direct the interpretation of the message.

There is but one other thought I would leave with you. The Latin teacher of to-morrow, to be efficient, will need adequate opportunity for practice teaching under trained and sympathetic supervision. What joy it has been to see the sincerity and the skill with which at our College some departments have cooperated in

facilitating the practice teaching of our men! I have had occasion to keep in touch with some of the assignments and I have observed the faithfulness of many teachers under whose immediate supervision the pupil-teachers have been placed. Patiently the usual beginner's errors have been noted and helpful suggestions for improvement have been offered. Not all, of course, have been equally conscientious. Some, indeed, would lead you to believe that they thought the bachelor's sheepskin possessed some magic whereby mere graduation from Schools giving certain pedagogical courses would convert the young graduate into an experienced teacher. Cicero, we recall, emphasized the importance of systematic training when he wrote (*Pro Archia* 15), . . . *Atque idem ego contendo, cum ad naturam eximiam atque inlustrem accesserit ratio quaedam conformatioque doctrinae, tum illud nescio quid praeclarum ac singulare solere existere.* . . .

If we agree with Cicero in this matter, we are sure to try to eliminate the distrust that at times seems to exist between the Department of the Classics and the Department of Education. Our departmental heads will encourage their most efficient teachers to take under observation and direction the prospective teachers of Latin, instead of complaining that the presence of these young people simply increases the supervisory burden. Here, indeed, I have felt that there is need for great improvement in our work of preparing the teachers of to-morrow.

It can readily be seen that the purpose of this paper has been not to picture an ideal teacher of Latin either of to-day or of to-morrow, but merely to draw attention to some considerations that must be borne in mind if the Latin teacher of to-morrow is to be what we all sincerely wish that teacher to be. Let us not forget, then, that in education as everywhere else in life change is inevitable. Accordingly, the Latin teacher of to-morrow must be unlike the Latin teacher of yesterday. Furthermore, in many respects we Latin teachers of to-day are the moulders of the Latin teacher of to-morrow. Ours is the responsibility for their development. We cannot escape it simply by bemoaning changed conditions or by criticizing others.

These, friends of the Classics, are some of the impressions made upon a teacher of Latin during a brief but very delightful and helpful experience in a School of Education.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,  
COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK GEORGE M. FALION

## REVIEWS

Early Greek Elegy, The Elegiac Fragments of Callinus, Archilochus, Mimnermus, Tyrtaeus, Solon, Xenophanes, and Others, Edited, with Introduction, Text, Critical Notes, and Commentary, by T. Hudson-Williams. Cardiff: The University of Wales Press Board; London: Humphrey Milford; New York: Oxford University Press (1926). Pp. 132.

Professor T. Hudson-Williams's book, *Early Greek Elegy*, contains a full Introduction (9-38), which is subdivided into a brief discussion of the claims to

seniority of Archilochus and Callinus (9-12), a discussion of Phrygians, Cimmerians, and Lydians (12-19), a lengthy note on Some Questions of Dialect (19-34), consisting of thirteen distinct articles, Bibliographical Notes (35-37), a note on the Manuscripts (37-38), and a list of Some Abbreviations.

The Introduction is followed by the Text, A. Elegies by Natives of Ionia (39-53: Callinus, 39-40, Archilochus, 40-43, Asius, 44, Mimnermus, 44-48, Xenophanes, 49-52, Anacreon, 52-53), B. Elegies by Greeks whose Native Dialect was not Ionic (54-70: Tyrtaeus, 53-59, Solon, 59-70, Cleobulina or Eumetis, Daughter of Cleobulus of Lindus, 70). The Commentary occupies pages 71-132.

In his Preface (3), Professor Hudson-Williams states that he "adopted the term 'Early Elegy' to denote all elegiac verse—except epigrams. . . , from Callinus to Xenophanes, inclusive". The elegies ascribed to Theognis, already edited by the same scholar in 1910, are not included, nor are recently discovered fragments like those in the Strasburg Papyrus.

The arrangement of the fragments has been based on a sharp distinction between the poets who spoke Ionic as their native language and those who adopted it as a form of 'poetic diction', but did not speak it in everyday life. Thus Group A, 'Pure Elegy', contains Callinus, Archilochus, Asius, Mimnermus, Xenophanes, and Anacreon. Group B, 'Foreign Elegy', contains Tyrtaeus, Solon, and Cleobulina (Eumetis).

Like Mr. J. M. Edmonds<sup>1</sup> in his *Lyra Graeca* (The Loeb Classical Library), Professor Hudson-Williams has adopted the excellent plan of giving the context of each extract or fragment, instead of leaving it in the anaemic and unsatisfactory isolation of so many previous editions. In fact, the contexts of the present book even improve on the lead set by Mr. Edmonds, for they are strict contexts and not mere matrices to which a scrap of elegy happens to have adhered.

The Introduction is excellent. The author begins by dismissing the barren controversy of the rival claims of Archilochus and Callinus to the title 'Father of Greek Elegy' with the remark that it is best left in the same position as that in which Horace, who presumably had at least as good authorities before him, was content to leave it (*Ars Poetica* 77-78). The all too meager and inconclusive evidence is adequately balanced and sifted.

The notes on the Phrygians, Cimmerians, and Lydians are extremely brief, but they are intended merely to give the environment of the Asiatic elegists and their historical orientation. Then follows one of the most valuable portions of the book, thirteen masterly notes on dialect and linguistic practice. Throughout these and the Commentary the editor refers constantly to the Ionic Inscriptions to support conclusions, often negative conclusions, reached by him. The comments on the aorist passive (30) and on Psilosis (26-28) are especially suggestive.

The Bibliography is complete and usefully arranged.

<sup>1</sup>*Lyra Graeca*, Being the Remains of all the Greek Lyric Poets from Eumelus to Timotheus, Excepting Pindar (The Loeb Classical Library). The volume was reviewed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.185-186).



The Text (39-53) follows the Codex Marcianus of Athenaeus and the text of Stobaeus by Wachsmuth and Hense (1884-1912). Occasionally, but with good reason, the editor departs from old tradition, as in Archilochus, Fragment 6, line 3, page 41 (the original of Horace's *relicta non bene parmula*, Carmina 2.7.10). Here Professor Hudson-Williams closely follows Hoffman<sup>2</sup> in reading *αὐτὸν δ' ἐξέσάωσα· τί μοι μέλει δόσις ἐκείνη;* instead of the old version, *αὐτὸς δ' ἐξέφυγον θανάτου· τίλος δόσις ἐκείνη* . . .

Apparently Professor Hudson-Williams suspects the fragment, ascribed by some to Tyrtaeus, which is found in a papyrus of the third century B. C., now in Berlin, published by von Wilamowitz<sup>3</sup>. At any rate, he does not include it under the other poems by Tyrtaeus, or elsewhere. This fragment of fourteen lines is clearly an incitement of some Dorian tribe to battle, and contains the word *Μεσσηνίων*, which suggests that the battle was in a Messenian War. We have no tradition of another early Peloponnesian elegist besides Tyrtaeus. It is possible that it is an Alexandrian imitation, though both the merits and the defects of the lines tell against this suggestion.

In the Commentary (71-132), the editor's object (Preface, 3) has been "to illustrate with full detail the close dependence of the early elegists upon the language and thought of the Homeric Poems". He has succeeded admirably, as may be seen from a consideration of Callinus 1, a fragment of twenty-one lines. On this we have ten pages of Commentary, beginning, as in the case of every poet treated in the volume, with a list of words not found in Homer, Hesiod, or the 'Homeric Hymns'. This piece of research alone is a valuable aid to the student of the elegy, and partly takes the place of the index with which so accurate a volume might well have been supplied. In these ten pages of commentary one does not feel overwhelmed with gratuitous erudition, as is so often the case in other books. In the study of such a neglected aspect of Greek poetry, notes like these are helpful and illuminating and are the fruits of what must be a very exact and wide study of the subject. Many references to Homer and Hesiod are quoted in full, and the student cannot fail to realize how the early elegists quarried profitably in the old mines of the Homeric Poems, adapting and borrowing beginnings of hexameters to form second halves of their own pentameters, and thus consciously or unconsciously reflecting his influence in a hundred forms and linguistic details.

The whole book is marked by a quality of accurate scholarship that is altogether admirable, and worthy of the earlier publications of its author. It gives fresh encouragement to students of a phase of Greek literature which has not received the attention it deserves, and is a choice contribution to existing work on elegy. The elegists contain, clear-cut as cameos, expressions of the Greek spirit, its directness, its pessimism, its civic wisdom and ideals, perhaps more striking than

any other outside the pages of Thucydides. Students of Professor Hudson-Williams's book will realize that much of their message is still true, that (Preface, 5) "... *Eunomia* and *Andreia* are but two sides of the same shield. . ."

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

A. G. C. MAITLAND

Das Antike Seewesen. Mit 104 Abbildungen in Text und auf Tafeln. By August Köster. Berlin: Schoetz und Parrhysius (1923). Pp. 254.

The contents of Dr. August Köster's book, *Das Antike Seewesen* (which has no Table of Contents) are as follows (with the titles of the several chapters translated, and with the page numbers given in Arabic, not in Roman, as in the book itself):

1. Egypt (9-44); 2. The Phoenicians (Including the Assyrians) (45-55); 3. Cretan-Mycenaean Shipping (56-68); 4. Shipping in Homer (69-83); 5. The Age of the Geometric Style (84-95); 6. Biremes and Triremes (96-110); 7. The Athenian Trireme of the Fifth Century (111-118); 8. The Tackle of the Triremes (119-122); 9. Officers and Crew of War Vessels (123-128); 10. Training of the Rowers (129-131); 11. The Ship-houses (132-136); 12. Size and Seaworthiness of the Triremes (137-142); 13. Ships with many Banks of Oars (143-150); 14. Merchant Vessels (151-157); 15. Size of Merchant Vessels (158-166); 16. Tackle of Sailing Vessels (167-176); 17. Speed of Sailing Vessels (177-181); 18. Equipment (182-185); 19. The Art of Navigation (186-204); 20. War Fleets and their Tactics (205-234); 21. The Pirates (235-250); Index (251-254).

Dr. Köster, who was already well-known from his study, *Die Nautik im Altertum* (1914), comes of a long line of experienced navigators, to whom the book is dedicated; he has traveled and made extensive and intelligent observations, and he has a masterly control of the archaeological and the literary evidence upon which his results are based. The style is fluent and entertaining despite the technical terminology in which many of the subjects are necessarily treated. The modern critical material is thoroughly in hand; I cannot recall any important study which has been overlooked, although it is a little hard to be sure on this point, since there is no systematic bibliography. The printing is admirable; I have noticed but two or three trifling misprints, and a couple of incorrect references to illustrations.

The wide range of subjects covered by the book makes it impossible to discuss every interesting question that could be raised, for each chapter might readily be expanded into a substantial monograph. Thus, for example, the disputed point regarding the extent to which slaves were employed on war vessels is not considered, but a study of the subject, by Dr. Rachel N. Sargent, published in *Classical Philology* 22 (1927), 264-279, has practically settled that controversy. A presentation of the literary evidence upon which some of the statements are based would occasionally be welcomed by a layman like myself, but of course the limits of space quite preclude any extensive citation of the sources of our information. But I know of no general introduction to the subject which is, on the whole, so thorough and so admirably presented, with

<sup>2</sup>Hoffman reads *αὐτὸν μ' ἐξέσάωσα*.

<sup>3</sup>Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1918, 728 ff.



such an obvious mastery of ancient evidence and modern criticism, and I take pleasure in recommending the book in the very highest terms to the readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

A few points of particular interest to myself may, perhaps, properly be listed here, as some indication of the wealth of fascinating matters which are considered. The author shows admirably how the ship-building of the Egyptians was dominated by two notable factors, first, the origin of their crafts in bundles of dry reeds tightly bound together, and, secondly, the necessity of building by pegging firmly to one another the small pieces of wood which alone can be secured from the acacia tree, a necessity which prevented them from ever laying a keel with long timbers. The assumption from the total absence of fortifications in Minoan Crete that the Empire of Minos was dependent for its security upon a war fleet is confirmed by the archaeological evidence, which shows prominent rams upon what must have been the very war vessels themselves (65-67). The substantial merits of even Homeric seamanship are excellently set forth, and the caution manifested by the Heroes in their navigation is shown to be entirely justified. Ancient war vessels were a crazy sort of craft, indeed; in connection with them every other consideration was subordinated to speed and the ramming tactics, and the author very properly shows that in all probability many more warships were sunk by the sea than by the enemy in actual battle. With merchantmen, however, the case was different. These frequently sailed across long stretches of open water, because the vessels of this type were infinitely more seaworthy than the craft employed in fighting. The Greeks were a practical people, also, who used the sea, indeed, as a means, but did not quite love it for its own sake, and as a kind of end in itself, as the Vikings loved it (82-83).

It is interesting, furthermore, to notice the invention of a dry-dock for the extremely large vessels of a later age (134). Fascinating is the notion that the 'astronomical instrument' of Antikythera may have been a kind of sextant (196-197). But I feel sceptical of the suggestion that the Pharos at Alexandria had a "Beleuchtungsapparat" which intensified the carrying power of its light, as well as a kind of telescope (199). I am inclined to believe, too, that Minoan silver was derived from the mines of Laurium, which were probably worked as early as that age, rather than from Spain (68). It is extremely doubtful, also, whether the Greek tribes which settled farthest South (i. e. the Dorians) were the earliest to migrate into Greece (69). On the other hand, the statement (138) that the Mesenian troops during the battle of Naupactus, in 423 B. C., were at the Achaean Rion (instead of the Locrian), is a mere slip; the correct account is given later (217). The anchor may actually have been invented in the North of Europe before Homer's time (although, of course, it was not known to the Greeks until later: 182), if the "anchor with two flukes at one end and a hole for a rope at the other", found in the debris of the lake-village of Mercurago,

north of Lake Maggiore in Italy<sup>1</sup>, should actually prove to be a prototype of the modern implement.

Not the least attractive feature of the work is the large number of zinc etchings and plates, many of the latter from excellent photographs, which present the principal archaeological evidence in an exact and effective manner. All in all this is an eminently substantial and interesting book.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

W. A. OLDFATHER

## BIG EARS AND LOQUACITY

Zeno once remarked to a prattling young man, 'Your ears have run down into your tongue' <sup>1</sup>. The same philosopher said<sup>2</sup> that we have two ears and only one tongue that we may hear more and speak less. This latter statement, however, does not explain the meaning of Zeno's comment on the young man, since bigger ears, according to this conceit, might be expected to hear more.

Aristotle holds that big ears are a sign of foolish talk and garrulousness<sup>3</sup>. An anonymous writer<sup>4</sup> on physiognomy says: 'Ἀδελσχοι vero sunt otiosi homines convenientes ad locum certum ineptisque narrationibus studentes et stolidis. Ἀδελσχοις Aristoteles dicit esse quibus aures magnae et ad voltum conversae sunt. . . . The passage in Aristotle is quoted also by Antigonos, *Historia Mirabilium* 114 (124), and by Galen<sup>5</sup>. Pliny the Elder notes (*Naturalis Historia* 11.276) that Trogus regards big ears as a sign of loquacity and foolishness. Other more or less similar passages are found in physiognomic writers<sup>6</sup>.

In view of these passages it seems clear that the explanation of the remark of Zeno is to be found in the folklore association of big ears with loquacity.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

## ON CATCHING ANIMALS BY NOTCHING TREES

Trader Horn (232) tells us that "the correctful thing in all literary books is to remember that even the truth may need suppressing if it appears out of tangent with the common man's notion of reality". In ancient descriptions of foreign countries that were comparatively little known the converse of this statement seems to have been true, since things out of tangent with reality were supplied in order to interest the reader.

Caesar tells us (*De Bello Gallico* 6.27) that in the Hercynian Forest there were elks (*alces*) which had no joints in their legs and that they rested by reclining

<sup>1</sup>See T. E. Peet, *The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy*, 290-291 (Oxford University Press, 1909).

<sup>2</sup>Diogenes Laertius, Book 7, account of Zeno 1.19.21.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibidem*, 1.19.23.

<sup>4</sup>*De Animalibus Historia* 1.11 = 492b, 2-3.

<sup>5</sup>Anonymi *De Physiognomonia Liber*, in R. Foerster, *Scriptores Physiognomici Graeci et Latini*, 2. 115, 6-10.

<sup>6</sup>Galen *Liber Quod Animi Mores Corporis Temperamenta Sequantur*, Chapter vii (C. G. Kühn's edition, 4. 797).

<sup>7</sup>Foerster (as cited in note 4), 1. 424, 5, 2. 65, 8, 129, 1-3, 154, 19, 169, 5.

against trees. Hunters, he adds, took advantage of this habit. By digging away the earth from the roots of trees or by notching the trees, hunters managed to catch the animals when they fell after their supports had given way.

I believe that, with variations, this was one of the common stories of antiquity. Some Ethiopian tribes are said to have caught elephants in this way. According to the tale as told by Diodorus Siculus 3.27, elephants cannot bend their knees and hence lean against trees to rest. Learning of their nightly retreats, the natives sawed into the trees a little above ground. The next morning they would find their victim lying heels upward before them and they would encamp around it until they had consumed it all.

A tribe of Elephantophagi that dwelt in Arabia adopted the same method, but notched the trees instead of sawing into them. In recording this story Strabo explains (16.4.10) that there is but one bone in the elephant's legs and that this bone is inflexible.

"Aye, we must pack in as much originality as we can" (Trader Horn, *ibidem*). There were forerunners of Trader Horn in antiquity.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

#### CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

##### III

Edinburgh Review—October, Rome of Yesterday and To-day, Luigi Villari; Greek Culture in Egypt, Stephen Gaselee ["It is seldom in the history of the world that one nation has taken more completely to itself the culture of another than, in appearance, Egypt accepted Greek ideas and habits after its conquest by Alexander. This process was even more rapid than the permeation of Rome by Greek thought two centuries later. By B. C. 300 Greece seemed to have won a spiritual and intellectual as well as a physical victory over the land of the Pharaohs. . . . Little as is now left in Egypt of the outward form of things Greek, they have played a great part in the history of the country"].

English Historical Review—October, Review, favorable, by M. P. Charlesworth, of Ernst Stein, Geschichte des Spätromischen Reiches, Band I; Short review, favorable, by R. A. S. M., of V. Pârvan, Dacia; Review, mildly unfavorable, by D. C. M., of Gustave Glotz, La Cité Grecque; Review, generally favorable, by C. W. P. O., of Ferdinand Lot, La Fin du Monde Antique et le Début du Moyen Âge.

Harvard Graduates Magazine—June, In Taberna Mori, Edward K. Rand [an essay on Goliardic poetry, with a number of verse translations].

Hibbert Journal—October, The Death of Plato, G. M. Sargeant [a short imaginative sketch].

Historische Vierteljahrschrift—October, Sparta, Helmet Berve [a fresh study of Sparta's place in the history of Greece]; Review, favorable, by P. Schoch,

of Felix Stähelin, Die Schweiz in Römischen Zeit; Review, favorable, by Arthur Stein, of Jean Colin, Les Antiquités Romaines de la Rhenanie; Short review, favorable, by M. Manitius, of Ernest Diehl (editor), Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres.

Illustrated London News—November 9, Cyprus as a "Treasure Island" of Archaeology: New Discoveries, Einar Gjerstad [this illustrated article deals with the results of excavations made on the sites of Vouni and Marion by the Swedish Archaeological Expedition in Cyprus. "Vouni and Marion together show the development of the Cypriote culture under Greek influence from the end of the archaic down to the end of the classical period"]; The Structure of Caligula's "Floating Palace" Now Fully Revealed [with two pages of illustrations].

Litteris—September, Detailed review, generally favorable, by G. Glotz, of The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume V; Review, favorable, by P. Ducati, of Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Great Britain, British Museum, Fascicles 1-4.

Living Age—September, Theophrastus to Shaw, Desmond MacCarthy.

Modern Language Notes—December, Review, generally favorable, by G. R. Coffman, of Edward K. Rand, Founders of the Middle Ages.

Modern Language Review—October, The Prototype of Dante's Geryon (Inferno XVI and XVII), A. R. Chisholm ["Dante, looking for a symbol of fraud, naturally picked on the stellion <stellio: compare e.g. Vergil, Georgics 4.243>, giving it gigantic proportions, and adding certain details; and then, seeking a name for this monster, adopted that of Geryon, because Geryon was directly related to Echidna and the Hydra, and because also he was one of Virgil's infernal forms" <Aeneid 6.289>]; Notes on Juan del Encina's 'Eclogas Trobadas de Virgilio', Ronald M. Macandrew [a study of the vocabulary, interpretations, and meter of Encina's translations].

Modern Philology—November, Platonism in Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, Robert V. Merrill ["To summarize: Petrarch uses in one poem a pair of indubitable borrowings from Plato's *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*, expression and underlying ideas both being Platonistic; but elsewhere in the *Canzoniere* there is nothing that clearly owes a debt to the Greek philosopher, and much that is definitely counter to the spirit of Platonic love"].

Review of English Studies—October, Short review, favorable, by G. C. Moore Smith, of John B. Emperor, The Catullian Influence in English Lyric Poetry, circa 1600-1650.

Saturday Review of Literature—December 14, Review, generally favorable, by Mary H. Swindler, of R. V. D. Magoffin and Emily C. Davis, Magic Spades, The Romance of Archaeology.

Studies (Irish Quarterly Review)—September, Epheusus, Pagan and Christian, Michael Tierney.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

J. W. SPAETH, JR.

### CLASSICAL CLUB OF GREATER BOSTON

The first meeting of the Classical Club of Greater Boston for the year 1929-1930 was held in the rooms of the Women's Republican Club, Boston, on Friday, November 15. Dinner was served at 6:30. In the absence of the President, Professor Charles B. Gulick, of Harvard University, Dr. Fred B. Lund presided. More than a hundred were present. The speaker of the evening, Professor William Chase Greene, of Harvard University, read a most interesting and scholarly paper on Self-revelation in Vergil: The Heart of a Poet. Arrangements for the work of the Reading Section, with Professor Donald Cameron, of Boston University, as Chairman, were announced.

HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS,  
DORCHESTER CENTRE,  
MASSACHUSETTS

ALBERT S. PERKINS, *Censor*

### THE CLASSICAL LEAGUE OF THE LEHIGH VALLEY

The Classical League of the Lehigh Valley held its semiannual meeting at Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pennsylvania, on Saturday afternoon, December 6. There was a large attendance of persons interested in the Classics. The President, Dr. A. S. Cooley, presided.

The following officers were elected: President, Dr. Myron J. Luch, of Lehigh University; Vice-President, Dr. George H. Allen, of Lafayette College; Secretary-Treasurer, Miss Mary L. Hess, of Bethlehem High School. The Executive Committee consists of Professor Luch, Dr. George T. Ettinger, of Muhlenberg College, and Miss Hess.

The following papers were read: The New York Times and the Teacher of the Classics, by Dr. Harry H. Reichard, of Muhlenberg College; My Summer in Rome, by Miss Gertrude G. Lear, of Bethlehem High School (Miss Lear was a member of the 1928 Summer Session of the School of Classical Studies of the American Academy in Rome); *Varia*, by Dr. A. S. Cooley, of the Moravian College for Women.

MARY L. HESS, *Secretary*

### RECAPTURING BACKGROUND<sup>1</sup>

In the third year of its existence Dr. Meiklejohn's Experimental College is pronounced a great success by the head of the institution that sponsors it, the University of Wisconsin. Indeed, Dr. Frank<sup>2</sup> likes the results so well that he is hoping to extend the system. It will be recalled that Dr. Meiklejohn gathered about him in an attractive community marked off for the purpose a group of picked students of the freshman class and was prepared, with the help of specially qualified instructors<sup>3</sup>, to follow through with them for two years. The first year it was the intention to devote very largely to aspects of Athenian civilization. Now comes President Frank to say that the whole undergraduate body would profit by such an experience.

### ATHENS IN WISCONSIN

According to an Associated Press report of the plan, two fifths of students' time would be subject to the regimen worked out in the Experimental College, which would mean "generally optional class attend-

<sup>1</sup>This editorial is reprinted from the periodical called *New York*, 3.50 (December 14, 1929). It was written by Mr. Harold De Wolf Fuller, Editor of *New York*. C. K. >

<sup>2</sup>I have long, myself, refused to accept as really valid testimony the approval, by an experimenter, of his own educational experiment. Certainly, such testimony should not be accepted unquestioningly. C. K. >

<sup>3</sup>Whence come all "the specially qualified instructors" that are required to conduct the vast array of Colleges that are 'different'? Why are so few of these "Specially qualified instructors" ever heard of, outside of the walls of these 'different' Colleges? C. K. >

ance and a concentrated study of all phases of some specific subject." Naturally, the subject would be broad enough, like Athenian civilization, to warrant so much attention being given to it. Dr. Meiklejohn was wise in choosing Greek culture for his original experiment. There is still vitality in that life, it seems, even though it is recorded in one of the "dead languages." More than that, he showed commendable boldness in launching this venture in a State having the reputation of being one of the most "progressive" in the Union, the home of the scientific method. If ancient Athens is regenerating Wisconsin, this speaks well for the character of the latter's progressiveness.

We need not labor the point. Athens is not the only open sesame for modern education. In selecting Athens, Dr. Meiklejohn hit upon a subject long congenial to him, and one whose springs he had seen refresh the finest flower of our Western thought. Other broad subjects will also serve the purpose, though it is likely that they should be remote from everyday needs in order to bring the best results.

### IN A LONG PERSPECTIVE

What strikes us as supremely important is the fact that by the plan under consideration a whole undergraduate body, or if it is not the aim to direct the attention of all the undergraduates to one given sphere of activity, at least large groups of students will be preoccupied over a considerable period of time with the same subject matter. They will thus acquire a common intellectual background<sup>4</sup>. This will be a great gain in an educational era which, starting with the elective system and experiencing all kinds of specialization, is badly in need of a focus.

Before—and for some time even after—the American college grew into a university, prescribed courses furnished undergraduates, one and all, with much the same food for thought. Prominent in the curriculum were the classics of Greece and Rome, the best English and American writers, mathematics up to, but fortunately not including, calculus, a certain amount of science and history and philosophy. This assignment of knowledge took on personality from outstanding figures. Collections of college songs included one whose Greek typography makes it difficult even to refer to now. Greek literature and mythology which John Hay, when Secretary of State, was so fond of quoting and which Mr. Gene Tunney made a poor stab at recently, had a familiar sound, even if one did not quite know what it was all about, to the ordinary student. Socrates lived with us; Jason and Medea and Prometheus were glowing figures. Harvey and Newton and Faraday were milestones in our lives.

<sup>4</sup>At a meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held several years ago, the point was made in debate that the substitution for Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil of selections from various authors, selections that, of necessity, would be limited in amount, if many authors and many works were to be included, would have one very unhappy result: even students of Latin would no longer have a common background of knowledge of the Classics themselves. Such students would no longer be exposed to the same experiences, would no longer deal with the same body of matter, and would no longer have the opportunity to enjoy the same or like cultural advantages.

One who has been obliged to give a course in Latin Literature in English Translations knows, if no one else does, how different a thing it is to try to make students who have no Latin or little Latin understand what he tries to say about the Latin authors from the task of talking about Latin authors, or even about English authors, to those who have studied Latin long and well. I once read to a class in Latin Literature in English Translations that fine passage in Plautus, *Bacchides*, beginning about verse 925 (I am writing this 800 miles away from my books), in which the whole story of the Trojan War is so gloriously outlined, and then I asked them whether they would like to be examined, *at once*, on the literary allusions in the passage, and if they would like, on the basis of such an examination, to have their intellectual worth compared—or contrasted—with that of the audience for which Plautus wrote this passage. I asked them finally what they thought of the statements so often made about Plautus, by good (?) critics, too, that of course one should not expect much from Plautus, if one only took into account the (lack of intellectual) quality of his audience (the same audience, by the way, that Terence, only a few years later, addressed). C. K. >



By contrast, what common bond is there among students today? Those in the same courses can get together and those with specialties can talk sympathetically with their fellows from whatever institution. But sport, broadly speaking, is now the sole common bond. And this, we contend, is a poor substitute for what used to be, as a matter of course. It was inspiring to see the youth of a whole nation wrestling with the same problems and stimulated by the same deeds of history. This did not mean that young men and women had turned their backs on the present. The late Barrett Wendell, of Harvard, used to say that an American of the twentieth century, suddenly transported to Greece in the age of Pericles, would be more at home than in contemporary China. They were looking at modern life in a long perspective.

#### ETERNAL TRUTHS

President Frank has given point to a serious educational question. He confines it to undergraduates, but it applies equally to the development of knowledge

on the part of whole universities. For knowledge has been broken up in order that it may be made more wieldy. The gain, to be sure, has been great. It can now be systematically applied with varying effectiveness, to most of man's modern needs. But there has been a loss, too, which is keenly felt. And so, along with specialization, there goes today a concerted effort to reassemble knowledge into large new combinations, of which the most conspicuous example is the Institute of Human Relations at Yale.

Now, the great advantage of the old curriculum consisted in the fact that it contained broad slices of life such as those indicated, especially ancient Greece, wherein the illustrative figures embodied broad principles and eternal truths. Knowledge was seen not only humanized but significant in a large sense. It is important that this rich common background of former college students be not lost unless ample provision is made to replace it. Apparently Messrs. Frank and Meiklejohn have not as yet discovered any wholly satisfying substitute.